

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is submitted in response to the non-final official action dated December 12, 2007. Claims 1-4 remain pending in this application with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings stating that numeral 29 was not mentioned in the description. The specification has been amended to add the numeral to the proper description. No new matter has been added. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection has been overcome.

Specification

The Abstract was objected to because the previously submitted abstract included other material. The abstract has been amended and thus, the objection has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner rejected claim 1-4 as being obvious over Sheu in view of Petter. Sheu discloses a steel floor structure, which extends between steel columns and includes, steel beams, surrounding frames around the columns and the beams, horizontal frames around the beams, connectors, anti-bend means, floor steel bars, reinforcing catch steel bars, and net plates laid on outer surfaces of the structure and used as outer concrete form plates. The floor steel bars 5 are arranged to lie through the space between the two horizontal support frames 2, having two ends fixed on the upper surfaces of the main steel members 1 of the beams and the two ends each having a fix extension bending down or up the outer side of the main steel member 1 of each beam, as shown in FIG. 2. The floor steel bars 5 are connected to steel means of other wall structures. Further insert steel bars 51 are provided to pass on the straight members 20 of the horizontal support frame 2 (as shown in FIG. 6), with two ends fixed with an inner wall of the two opposite beams (by means of welding, bolts or binding). A plural catch steel bars 6 shown in FIG. 6 are connected to the connect means 10 of the main steel members 1, having one end

USSN: 10/511,714
Reply to Office Action of 12/12/2007

extending in the floor structure and the horizontal support frames 2, and the other end curved to form a hook 60 to strengthen catching effect of the steel floor structure against concrete.

Nowhere does Sheu describe a construction method, which is assembled around a high rise core of a structure from which the entire remaining structure (residence space) extends. The Examiner conceded that Sheu does not "expressly disclose the steps of ... installing a steel frame pillar on a shaft portion of the core", and thus, he cites a secondary reference of Petter. Petter, according to the Examiner would teach the missing step that is, installing a steel frame pillar (13, Fig. 3) on a shaft of the core (15). However, Applicant submits that the examiner erred in his reading of the secondary reference. Petter, a reference of 1942, predates any modern SRC high rise constructions and is directed to a one story, small wooden frame demountable dwelling house of pre-fabricated construction, of the type used for cheap and temporary "war workers". It merely comprises four wooden rectangular uprights which are erected from a concrete foundation frame. On top of the uprights, two types of horizontal beams are mounted to the uprights. The other end of the horizontal beams is connected to other frame members with lag screws and bolts. Wooden roof panels rests on the beams. The central four upright structures can hardly be equated to applicant's high rise building core which is constructed according to providing for installing a steel-frame pillar on a shaft portion of the core. Nowhere does Petter describe any core walls. The concrete foundation remains a base; there are no concrete walls, let alone a description of any connections between concrete core walls and horizontal steel structures. Thus, in every respect, Petter teaches away from the present claimed invention.

The Examiner points to Fig. 6 of Sheu and stated that the girder would include an anchor ~connecting member, to which a steel frame beam is connected. However, Fig. 6 does not represent the core wall, but it discloses the connection relationship between the slab component and the core girder on the ground. What the Examiner identified as a core is actually a slab. Similarly, numeral 4 is not a column, but a sub beam for anti-bending

USSN: 10/511,714
Reply to Office Action of 12/12/2007

measured. Numeral 1 of Fig. 6 is a girder, not a column.

A claim is properly rejected as obvious over a combination of references; it must also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, an obviousness rejection can be overcome by showing that the claim is different from the reference (or combinations of references) in ways which would not have been obvious and/or, when the Examiner has combined references, by showing that it would not have been obvious to make the combination. Until recently, obviousness was typically established by the Examiner providing some teaching, suggestion or motivation for the combination. Recently, the Supreme Court in *KSR, Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. ____ (2007) clarified the basis for obviousness rejections by emphasizing that there need not necessarily be any teaching, suggestion or motivation for the combination.

Viewed under the KSR standard and viewing the references as a whole, the obviousness rejection is not proper because the combination is not at all a predictable use of known elements according to their established functions. In addition, a person skilled in the art would never have a reason to resort to a one story demountable wooden barrack type of structure of Petter and combines it with the steel floor structure of Sheu and comes up with applicant's presently claimed invention of a method for constructing a high rise building having a core and a residence space around the core, the method comprising the steps of (a) installing a steel-frame pillar on a shaft portion of the core; (b) connecting a girder to the steel-frame pillar, the girder includes an anchor-connecting member to which a steel-frame beam is connected, a portion of the anchor-connecting member being buried in a core wall; (c) assembling the steel-frame beam on the anchor-connecting member; (d) arranging reinforcing bars in a deck plate or a slab type mold installed on the steel-frame beam, and in the core wall; and (e) applying a slab concrete and a core concrete simultaneously or in this order, as claimed in claim 1.

USSN: 10/511,714
Reply to Office Action of 12/12/2007

Similarly, the combination would not result is a method wherein, in addition to the subject matter of claim 1, a plural sub-connecting members for supporting the deck plate or the slab type mold are installed on the girder installed between the steel-frame pillars, the sub-connecting members including a connecting member coupled to the girder and a supporting member coupled to one end of the connecting member, as claimed in claim 2.

Furthermore, the combination would not result is a method wherein, in addition to the subject matter of claim 1, the anchor-connecting member comprises a connecting member connected to the girder by welding or bolts, an anchor plate connected to the connecting member by welding or bolts, a gusset plate welded on the anchor plate, and a stud or shear connector extended from the anchor plate to the concrete wall and buried in the concrete, as claimed in claim 3.

And lastly, the combination would not result is a method wherein, in addition to the subject matter of claim 1, the step (c) further comprises the steps of forming a slot hole on the anchor-connecting member and coupling a high tensioned bolt in the slot hole to be assembled on the steel-frame beam, as claimed in claim 4.

Thus, the combination of references does not render the claims obvious and such rejection should be withdrawn in view of the above arguments.

USSN: 10/511,714
Reply to Office Action of 12/12/2007

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this be considered a petition therefore. The Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE


Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account

No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By



Christa Hildebrand
Reg. No. 34,953
875 Third Avenue - 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844
Facsimile: (212) 808-0844

USSN: 10/511,714
Reply to Office Action of 12/12/2007